

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

The uncorrected transcript can be found at: [https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/lcdocs/transcripts/3557/Transcript%20-%20PC7%20-%2025%20August%202025%20-%20Budget%20Estimates%20\(Scully\)%20UNCORRECTED.pdf](https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/lcdocs/transcripts/3557/Transcript%20-%20PC7%20-%2025%20August%202025%20-%20Budget%20Estimates%20(Scully)%20UNCORRECTED.pdf)

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
1	7	The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: Has the department done any work with respect to the investigation of the Tempe bus depot precinct for rezoning? Mr PAUL SCULLY: I'll take that on notice. I am not aware of any. Ms Fishburn? I don't know.	The Department has not undertaken any work with respect to a rezoning of the Tempe Bus Depot precinct.
2	9-10	The CHAIR: You're right. Can I move on to a different issue? This is the New South Wales Court of Appeal's matter in the MACH Energy—the Mount Pleasant case. In light of that court decision, will you now be reviewing and amending the relevant guidelines, including the Social Impact Assessment Guideline, to ensure that local climate impact assessments are addressed? Mr PAUL SCULLY: I might make a general comment, and then Mr Gainsford may wish to add some more in terms of the case itself. I think it is important, Chair, that everyone is familiar with what had happened here. There was a challenge to the Mount Pleasant coalmine expansion. After a challenge was upheld by the Land and Environment Court on the project, the New South Wales Court of Appeal agreed on one thing and didn't agree on another thing. It didn't agree with the argument made about conditions to limit scope 3 emissions. It accepted that scope 3 emissions were regulated and accounted for, but it did agree with the argument about consideration of the impact of locality on scope 3 emissions. That cascades down into how we deal with that in an assessment phase. The court ordered that the matter be sent back to the Land and Environment Court for consideration as to whether orders can or should be made which, if complied with, would validate the development consent for the expansion project. The parties are waiting, as I understand it. I haven't heard anything different this morning. The parties are awaiting confirmation from the Land and Environment Court on a listing to commence that. In terms of what that	The Minister is committed to reviewing and appropriately actioning legal advice when it is received.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		means though and what we might do with respect to more general assessment matters, I might give— KIERSTEN FISHBURN: I will pick that one up. We have requested that our lawyers have a look at what came out of the court case and look at the implications for the department. That work is currently underway, so I don't have an answer for you at this point, Chair, but we are undertaking that review. The CHAIR: So you will follow all good advice from lawyers, and if that advice comes to suggest that you will need to now review your secretary's environmental assessment requirements and you will need to go through all those current assessments in the pipeline to ask proponents to go back and address those matters, you would do that? Mr PAUL SCULLY: We'll look at what the implications are and seek advice.	
3	11-12	The Hon. JOHN RUDDICK: I might stay with you, Ms Gibson, because my next question is also about the floor-space ratio. A good proxy for planning efficiency is the amount of litigation. I understand from various sources that the Land and Environment Court spends a lot of its time squabbling over the definition of floor-space ratios. What percentage of the volume of work at the Land and Environment Court do you think is devoted to solving this issue of floor-space ratio? MONICA GIBSON: I don't have any of that information available to me. Mr PAUL SCULLY: I think the Attorney General would be better. It would be better addressed to the Attorney General, perhaps. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: There is a clear separation between the department and the Land and Environment Court, as there should be. We don't hold that data. The Hon. JOHN RUDDICK: If we looked over the last 10 years, would we be seeing a significant growth in the amount of litigation going through the Land and Environment Court? Is it increasing, decreasing or remaining static?	This is a matter for the Attorney General.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		KIERSTEN FISHBURN: My understanding is it's remained fairly static, outside of the COVID years where it did seem to increase a little. We can take that on notice.	
4	12	The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: Minister, I have had a quick look at your diary disclosures and note that I can only see the first half of this year. I see you met with Lithgow City Council. That was on a sitting day, so I presume that was in here. You also met with the chancellor of the university of Western Sydney. In the first half of this year, Minister, have you been further west than Penrith? Mr PAUL SCULLY: The first half of this year—I can't remember when I was in Broken Hill. The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: That was last year. Mr PAUL SCULLY: That was last year? Sorry. I'd have to double-check. I can't remember the dates.	I routinely meet with a range of stakeholders including both State and Federal Members of Parliament, industry representatives, local community groups and representatives, local government officials and Councillors, and peak organisations to discuss a vast range of matters relating to the NSW planning system.
5	29	The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: Minister, in the Private Agreement Guideline for State significant renewable energy developments, it mentions that, in most cases, land values increase significantly when hosting wind energy projects. Assuming that's been evidenced, do we have similar evidence on the assumptions on the land value of neighbouring properties? Mr PAUL SCULLY: I'm not aware of anything. I can take it on notice in terms of whether any work has been done on that, but nothing springs to mind. I'm taking what you have read as being accurate. I've got no reason to doubt you. I just haven't got anything to mind in terms of neighbouring properties.	Several studies conducted by organisations have not found a clear correlation between wind energy developments and declining property values, including: • In 2009, the NSW Valuer General appointed Duponts and Preston Rowe Paterson to undertake an assessment of the impact of wind farms on property values. This assessment revealed there was no conclusive evidence available at the time to indicate a universal fall in the value of surrounding properties or that could be attributed to wind farm developments. • An independent report commissioned by the former NSW Office of Environment and Heritage and undertaken by Urbis in 2016, did not identify any conclusive trends that would indicate wind farms negatively impacted on property values, based on the available data and review of case studies in NSW and Victoria. • PRD Real Estate also produced a report in October 2022, following its review of the impact on property prices in six local government areas

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
			in NSW and Victoria, which concluded property values rose significantly, between 35 and 51%, over five years – attributed to increased population growth, wage price growth, lower local unemployment and higher rental yields directly as a result of renewable energy developments in a region. Although potential impacts on property values are not specifically a consideration in the planning decision-making process, there are a range of measures in place to make sure there are no significant impacts on surrounding properties. These include setbacks to protect visual amenity and stringent noise criteria.
6	32	The CHAIR: Before I go to Ms Mihailuk, by way of extension, the former department of agriculture has tried to prohibit Planning from taking steps in the past. Ms Faehrmann is right. The background to this is long. Mr PAUL SCULLY: It's not a history I'm aware of, Chair. But, as I've said to Ms Faehrmann and the Committee, I'm happy to go away and have a look at it in more detail. I can't say anything more than that. I don't think I can sit here and unilaterally make changes to the way the planning system operates. I think everyone would appreciate and want me to do things in the face of evidence rather than not.	The Department considers the views of all relevant stakeholders when making planning decisions.
7	33-34	The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: That's good to hear. Can I also ask you about Bankstown, specifically West Terrace. I put to you some questions on notice in relation to the West Terrace car park being compulsorily acquired for the purposes of open space, as part of the Transport Oriented Development Program. Are you aware of my questions? Do you recall those questions, Minister? Mr PAUL SCULLY: I'm aware you put a range of questions on notice. The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: You said to me that it was council that always earmarked it to be open space. Is that correct? Mr PAUL SCULLY: If you're saying that's what I said, I can only take it as such. If you're wrong, of course, then you're wrong.	The City of Canterbury-Bankstown Council has not provided written feedback regarding compensation. The matter is subject to ongoing discussions between council and the Department.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: Did your office or your department look at the added value to the properties surrounding West Terrace car park and what it would mean for those properties by the Government compulsorily acquiring the West Terrace car park and turning that into open space? Mr PAUL SCULLY: Sorry, I'm not sure what your question is. The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: By the Government making that decision—to remove a car park right next to the metro station and turn it into open space. I'm not understanding the purpose of why that was made into open space. Is that adding value the properties surrounding, in your view? Mr PAUL SCULLY: It could be argued that that might add some value. I think adding value would be a metro station across the street, wouldn't it? That would add much more value. The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: Yes. Mr PAUL SCULLY: Arguably any positive embellishment to any land nearby within a reasonable distance could have a positive impact on land valuations. I'm not a land valuer, and the department isn't a land valuer, so I can't say. The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: What does it mean for the car park? Have the councils written to you and said that they want additional funding now for an alternative car park? Is that right? Mr PAUL SCULLY: We have ongoing discussions about parking in and around Bankstown metro station and that associated green space. The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: Did the council write to you that they thought they weren't fairly compensated? Mr PAUL SCULLY: I don't know if they wrote to me with that characterisation or turn of phrase. The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: Can you take it on notice? Mr PAUL SCULLY: That might be a paraphrasing of it. Have you got the letter there? The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: No, I don't. I'm asking you.	

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		Mr PAUL SCULLY: I'll look for that turn of phrase. The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: There was a council meeting where there was a point made by the general manager that they had written that, and I just want to know if they had written to you. Mr PAUL SCULLY: Councils write to me regularly, including Canterbury-Bankstown council, and we're having ongoing discussions— The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: Can you provide—what was the amount that council was paid? Could you take that on notice? Mr PAUL SCULLY: If I could finish, whether or not council has written to me with that turn of phrase, I don't know. The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: Can you take on notice how much the council was paid for the Government compulsorily acquiring the West Terrace car park? Mr PAUL SCULLY: I don't think it has been finalised. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: It hasn't been finalised. The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: So you're in discussions now? MONICA GIBSON: We have not made an offer to council for the compulsory acquisition of that land. The Hon. TANIA MIHAILUK: But you will? MONICA GIBSON: That's unclear at this point in time.	
8	45	The Hon. MARK LATHAM: We've had enough positivity; let's be serious. Who's the probity adviser doing the review of what has occurred? Mr PAUL SCULLY: I don't have the name in front of me. I'll take it on notice. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Who is the probity adviser that sat in on the meeting? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: I'll take that on notice. It was an independent probity adviser at that point in time.	Centium is the original probity advisor engaged to oversee Housing Delivery Authority meetings and was the advisor at the original meeting when this Expression of Interest (EOI) was considered. The Department is currently doing conflict of interest checks before finalising procurement for a second independent probity advisor who will review the EOI evaluation, Minister's declaration, Secretary's environmental assessment requirements (SEARs) request and amended declaration process for EOI 229650.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Are they separate outfits, not the same one? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: I believe so, but I'll check for you. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Okay, if we can get that on notice.	
9	51	The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: I would draw your attention to the fact that a website has been created called sydneyinternationalkarts.com.au. Funnily enough, the holder of that domain registry is a Mr Troy Boldy. There are several Google reviews and reviews on the site that actually go through and thank a "Troy" who is involved in the operation of those speedway karts, if I can draw that to your attention. With respect to that operation, would that be something that would be permissible under the lease that is taken out on Sydney International Speedway? MELANIE HAWYES: We're in discussions with them at this point in time. I can't really say beyond that. I understand they're interested in holding those kinds of events. The parkland trust is in discussions with them about that. But that's with the head lessee rather than—as you note, the dragway operator is Mr Beuk. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: So they have full control? It doesn't go back to Greater Sydney Parklands as to what goes on in that site? MELANIE HAWYES: I'll take it on notice, because they're licensed as well by the Office of Sport, so it would be a dual consideration would be my understanding. I might need to take that aspect on notice.	Control of site in relation to karting Recreational karting forms part of Sydney International Speedway plans for activation of the Speedway site. Greater Sydney Parklands is working with the leaseholder regarding the requirements to commence recreational karting at the site. A licence for recreational karting is not required from the Office of Sport. Western Sydney International Dragway Ltd has the head lease for Western Sydney International Speedway.
10	51-52	The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: When did Mr Willmington cease to be the track operator? MELANIE HAWYES: On 15 July we were advised that he would no longer continue in his role. The track manager is hired by the venue operator. I have advice that they have hired a subsequent venue operator, which is Mr Mitch Biner, who I referred to in my previous answer. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: When did he become the licence holder of that track operator?	Appointment of new track manager Greater Sydney Parklands was notified about the new track manager appointment on 28 July 2025. Operational delays due to track challenges The leaseholder is working towards commencing the season in mid-October, which is in line with the start of previous seasons. Greater Sydney Parklands

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		MELANIE HAWYES: I'll need to take the precise date on notice. They ran it through an expression of interest process to source a new track operator. He has been appointed. I'm not exactly sure of the date of his appointment. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: Considering that at present there is no operation of a speedway at the site, nor a 2025-26 calendar which has been published, it would seem that the only operation at the moment is with respect to the karting. Is that in breach of the licence and the lease to the speedway? MELANIE HAWYES: No, I don't think that's a fair characterisation. As I've said to you, they have expressed an interest in undertaking karting. They are developing the schedule—the season doesn't start until October—so there is a schedule under development. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: It has been outlined as well, I believe, that the operations have been pushed back at the speedway because of challenges on the track. Is that your understanding? MELANIE HAWYES: Not completely my understanding, no. It is a matter for them to determine their schedule of events, rather than the landlord, which is us. We're really in their hands as to their preferred scheduling. I understand that they were doing some enhancements, but I would need to take on notice—is your claim that there is delay because there's an issue with the track? Is that what you're suggesting? The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: That is my understanding. Let me find it in my notes. I believe that there was a statement that was made by the new operator with respect to that. I might come back to that. MELANIE HAWYES: I can try and chase that up for this afternoon so that we can answer it today, but not to my understanding. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: I believe it's with respect to the catch fence compliance on the track. MELANIE HAWYES: Can I come back to you? Because I wasn't aware of an issue with that. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: Yes, okay. MELANIE HAWYES: Great, thank you.	and the leaseholder are working through a small number of maintenance matters before the season commences. Lease discounts A four-month, rent free period was offered at the commencement of the lease in December 2023.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: I believe that was outlined by Mr Biner as well in a social media post of 23 August 2025. MELANIE HAWYES: On 23 August? Can I chase that up and come back to you today? The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: Yes. MELANIE HAWYES: Great, thank you. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: I believe that is an issue—which sadly I didn't have last week—that the New South Wales Office of Sport is aware of and will not issue an MVRG licence until these works have been completed. MELANIE HAWYES: Those works may very well be in train. I will come back to you. I'll get an update. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: With respect to the lease payments and any arrangements by the speedway, are they all up to date? MELANIE HAWYES: To my understanding, unless you've got other intel. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: No. MELANIE HAWYES: To my understanding, all is in order. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: Have any discounts been offered? MELANIE HAWYES: Since the beginning of the lease or recently? The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: I think we previously had talked about the first couple of months. MELANIE HAWYES: Yes, we've previously— The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: Since that point in time, apart from the initial discounts that were offered. MELANIE HAWYES: I would need to check, because those discounts were related to track upgrades at the time. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: If you can take those on notice, that would be helpful.	

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		MELANIE HAWYES: Yes, absolutely. I'll try and get that for you today.	
11	54	The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: On that 28 days that you said often gets extended, how often are we talking? And if I can throw into that question, who determines "Let's extend this one but cut this one off at 28 days"? DAVID GAINSFORD: It's the department's decision at the end of the day. I wouldn't say it's often extended. I can take it on notice in terms of how many times we've extended in the last 12 months or for renewable energy projects. I'm happy to come back with some more information there. Again, it's largely on the basis of the complexity of the development and how much interest there is in that development.	Since March 2023, there has been extended exhibitions for 11 projects: • Mayfair Solar - was exhibited for 54 days. • Dinawan Solar – 32 days. • Bellambi Heights Battery Energy Storage system (BESS) – 34 days. • Panorama BESS – 30 days. • Homebush BESS – 33 daysHumelink Transmission Line – 42 days. • Oven Mountain Pumped Hydro – 32 days. • Central-West Orana Renewable Energy Zone Transmission Line – 42 days. • Paling Yards Wind Farm – 32 days. • Burrendong Wind Farm – 35 days. • Tchelery Wind Farm – 32 days.
12	56-57	The Hon. MARK LATHAM: I hope you can also understand that private landowners with property rights can have a different perspective because the situation at Rhodes has been that these private landowners see themselves as small players that in some instances have been disadvantaged by this big company, and they too can google some of the controversies that Billbergia has been involved in. You can be assured that when they weren't even asked about this and then they found out that the State significant development declaration had been made for land that they owned and hadn't given consent to, they took it as quite an insult and took it also, quite legitimately, as a sign that yet again the big player has received some treatment that they weren't even aware of. Surely, we've got to correct that problem, haven't we? People have property rights. People have, as citizens as opposed to public servants, the right to know what decisions are being made about their own land, especially when they're in a situation where they don't regard Billbergia as their friend, their ally, their confidant. This company had no permission or communications with	While the Department has not received any letters from the de-declared lot owners, the Department has corresponded via email and phone calls as follows: (a) An email from Robert Barrie, representing Marobar Holdings Pty Ltd, the owner of 15 Leeds Street, was received by the Department on 16 July 2025, requesting a copy of the submission by Billbergia for expression of interest (EOI) 229650. On 24 July 2025, a Departmental officer from the Housing Delivery Authority (HDA) Secretariat team responded that 15 Leeds Street does not form part of the proposed development and that the Ministerial Order that declared the site State significant development (SSD) has been amended (page 10, <i>State Significant Development Declaration Order (No. 11) 2025</i>), and that, to protect the integrity of the HDA pathway, EOI submissions are not made publicly available.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		them. These citizens—these people of New South Wales who've done nothing more than own their own land and stand up for their rights—feel like they've been really badly treated. What can you do to overcome that situation in the future other than say, "If there is a problem, we sort it out later on2"? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: I think I've already answered that question for you. There's a point in the planning system when landowners' consent is required. I would expect, as we continue to work through the HDA, if there are needs to sharpen things, we will sharpen them. Local landowners in Rhodes have not made representations to me so I have not heard that directly from them. I'm happy to discuss their concerns with them if they wish. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: I'm their public representative and I'm making it to you. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: And I'm listening. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Have you got any sympathy for these people, in the way they've been treated? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: As I've just said, they have not made representations to me but I'm more than happy— The Hon. MARK LATHAM: They don't have to; they're doing it through me. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: I'm more than happy to meet— The Hon. MARK LATHAM: What do you think my job is? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: I'm more than happy to meet with them and discuss their concerns. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Thank you. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: If I could clarify, in a sense, I think that there has been a letter that has gone to you, Ms Fishburn— DAVID GAINSFORD: To the department. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: —so you might want to check that up with respect to it.	(b) On 8 August 2025, an email from Matt Barrie was received stating that Lot 18/239579 is NSW Crown Land with title held by Alpha Distribution Ministerial Holding Corporation (CN AK971571). On 12 August 2025, an officer from the HDA Secretariat team responded confirming that the site is included as part of SSD-89441959 which relates to the declared EOI 229650, and that landowners consent is not required to lodge an EOI application with the HDA or to request Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements, however landowner's consent is required with the lodgement of the Environmental Impact Statement. (c) On 1 August 2025, an email was received by the HDA Assessment team from Caleb Ball of Solve Property, representing the landowner/s of 3 sites which were removed from the SSD declaration by way of the amendment to EOI 229650 under <i>State Significant Development Declaration Order (No. 11) 2025</i>. The email stated that these sites are 'left exposed if the surrounding land is progressed independently' and requested further information regarding the scope and timing of the concurrent rezoning/SSD application and associated SEARs request. On 5 August 2025, the HDA Assessments team met with Caleb Ball to discuss these and related issues. (d) On 16 July 2025, an email was received from Ross Schinella, the owner of 19 and 21 Leeds Street requesting a copy of Billbergia's EOI 229650. On 24 July 2025, an officer in the HDA Secretariat team responded that it has been identified that these two sites do not form part of the proposed development and that the Ministerial Order that declared the site SSD has been amended by page 10, <i>State Significant Development Declaration Order (No. 11) 2025</i>. On 7 July 2025, the HDA Assessments team met with Georgia Sedgmen of Gyde Consulting and Mark Lollback, owner of 3 and 6 Leeds Streets. Mr Lollback advised that he was not aware of the details of the proposal, the developer had not sought permission to control the lots and that he is concerned that the site may become isolated with a diminished future development capacity. The Department advised that formal landowner's consent is not required for the EOI process but would be required at the time of the lodgement of the SSD.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		DAVID GAINSFORD: I think there was some correspondence that came to the department; I think you're right. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: Thank you, I appreciate that clarification. I'll have a look at that. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Can we, on notice, get the response to that, please? Can you take on notice what response has been made to them? DAVID GAINSFORD: Yes, I'm happy to do that. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: They haven't been inactive; they've just been badly treated.	
13	57-58	The CHAIR: Secretary, I have a couple of questions for you about, in particular, the silver mine and the Court of Appeal judgement. How many meeting requests has your department had from Bowdens Silver or Silver Mines representatives, or their lawyers, since the Court of Appeal judgement on 16 August, where Bowdens approval was deemed null and void? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: From Bowdens itself or Silver Mines representatives? The CHAIR: Both of those. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: I'm seeking clarity because I'm definitely going to have to take that on notice. To my knowledge, though—that is fairly recent—none have come directly to me, but I will take that on notice and we'll go through my correspondence. Otherwise it probably would have come to Mr Gainsford. We'll see what we can find out. We might not be able to find it out by this afternoon. The CHAIR: Thank you, I'd appreciate that. Are you able to indicate how many meetings have happened with Bowdens or other Silver Mines representatives? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: Again, from myself, I can say none. However, that's not my primary role. There may well have been departmental meetings held. I can see David flicking through his notes. We may have to take that on notice.	The Department has met with the proponent approximately 11 times since the judgement on 16 August 2024. The Department has also engaged with the Mudgee Region Health Alliance seven times during this period, including most recently a meeting with the Minister's Office on 10 September 2025.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		DAVID GAINSFORD: Yes, I'm pretty sure we do have those records, so I'm happy to come back with it. The CHAIR: Mr Gainsford, do you think there have been meetings? DAVID GAINSFORD: Yes, I'm aware that there have been several meetings with department officers and the applicant. The CHAIR: When you say "several", is it really several—a couple, several, a few, lots? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: I'll need to come back to you, Chair.	
14	59	The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: Possibly to you, Secretary, but feel free to punt this to whoever's most appropriate. The department of planning is responsible for compliance under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: Correct, yes. The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: Is there a specific compliance team? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: Yes, that is correct. They sit in Mr Gainsford's area. The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: How big is that team? DAVID GAINSFORD: I think I will need to take the precise number on notice, but my understanding is we're around about 35 to 40 people in our compliance area.	Current number of Compliance roles: 36 Current allocation of staff: • Sydney based - 20 • Newcastle - 3 • Maitland - 4 • Wollongong - 3 • Murwillumbah - 3 • Queanbeyan - 3 Further planned expansion of 14 additional staff, including a new Central West Team, following additional funding from 25/26 budget in response to both Renewable Energy and Housing projects. This will take the Compliance team to 50 staff.
15	60	The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: As far as taking those numbers, can I get a breakdown of where they're located—that compliance team? DAVID GAINSFORD: In terms of where they're actually situated, in terms of their offices? The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: Yes.	Of the 51 inspections undertaken last financial year, 43 were proactive and eight were reactive. Of the reactive, three were in relation to complaints, and the remaining five relate to the Department's review of required documents such as independent audits and issues/items requiring inspection. The Department received 219 complaints in 2024/2025 (all project types). All complaints are received or logged in the planning portal.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		DAVID GAINSFORD: I'm happy to take that on notice. We do have some that are based up in Newcastle and Muswellbrook, and we've got a number of people that are based, obviously, in the CBD. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: I think we've got Dubbo, if I remember correctly. The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: You can take that on notice. DAVID GAINSFORD: Yes, we're looking to establish an office in Dubbo as well. The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: It's the same people doing compliance on mines that are doing compliance on the renewables? DAVID GAINSFORD: Yes, largely it's the same people that are doing that. That's correct. The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: Just as a punt, have you any breakdown of the time they spend on each? DAVID GAINSFORD: I do have some statistics here, Mr Barrett. What I can tell you is in the last financial year, in the mining and quarrying space, we had 79 inspections which were undertaken. Sixty-three investigations were completed, 39 complaints were received and 329 compliance reporting matters were reviewed. In the renewable energy space, we had 51 inspections of renewable energy projects. I don't have the same breakdown of some of those other matters that I just mentioned before, but we did take six formal enforcement actions with regard to renewable energy projects. The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: That's sort of half pre-empted a few of my questions. Are there notices followed by PINs? Is that how it works? DAVID GAINSFORD: Depending on the issue that's been discovered as part of the compliance activities, we have a process of determining what is the relevant level of enforcement action that's required. What I can tell you is of those six that I mentioned before in the renewable energy space, one resulted in a penalty notice, which is \$15,000, and there was two official cautions and three orders. The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: Of those 51 inspections, how many of them were proactive and how many of them were in response to complaints?	

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		DAVID GAINSFORD: I would need to take that on notice. The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: How many complaints do you receive through the Planning Portal? DAVID GAINSFORD: We'd need to take that on notice as well.	
16	61	The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: We also talked earlier about land values. Looking at the guidelines, they said that land values traditionally increase when they have wind turbines on them. Was there any assessment done on the values of neighbouring properties? DAVID GAINSFORD: Mr Barrett, I'm aware that there's been previous studies that have looked into land values associated in the vicinity of renewable energy projects. The department hasn't done its own research in recent times, but I am aware that there have been previous studies that have looked into this. My understanding from those studies is that it hasn't identified that there's been a decrease in land values. In fact, in some cases, the studies have actually talked about an increase in land values, mainly as a result of, over time, land increasing in value per se, maybe not as a result of the renewable energy project. I think the last report that I'm aware of was in 2022 that was done around land values. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: While not necessarily having pulled it together as a full dataset, of course, the work that Value NSW does to undertake land valuations over a three-year rolling cycle would actually provide that data as to whether values had changed or not over a period of time. I just don't think anyone's aggregated the information. The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: Still on the guidelines, there's one there about fire safety in the wind turbines suggesting that wind turbines don't pose a greater risk of starting a bushfire or impeding firefighting efforts than other similar types of infrastructure, including communication towers. That would be supported or evidenced by someone from the RFS? DAVID GAINSFORD: Yes, Mr Barrett, all of the assessments that we do for renewable energy projects, including wind farms, we seek advice from the	Links to NSW Rural Fire Service (RFS) advice on selected wind farm projects: Pottinger Wind Farm: - RFS advice on Submissions Report – Link: Pottinger - RFS advice on Submissions Report. Spicers Creek Wind Farm - RFS Advice on Submissions Report - Link: Spicers Creek Wind - RFS advice on Subs Report.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		Rural Fire Service, so that would be very influential in our assessment of those projects. The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: Are you able to table that advice on notice? DAVID GAINSFORD: With regard to specific projects or with regard to— The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: Wind turbines. In my head, one communication tower in the middle of the paddock—I can get that. But if you've got 40 300-metre towers, all a couple of hundred metres from each other, that is going to make flying an RFS chopper around that place dangerous, hence impeding firefighting efforts. I just wonder what advice you have to suggest that wouldn't be the case. DAVID GAINSFORD: All the advice that we would receive from Rural Fire Service on each one of the projects that we assess is publicly available. It's part of the package that we put on our website, so happy to draw your attention to perhaps some of the more recent wind farms that we've assessed. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: Yes. We can give you the last three or four and examples of the RFS advice that would come back, because obviously it's bespoke to the particular development application, but if we give you enough examples so you can see the diversity of response.	
17	61-62	The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: Going to the identification of sites, Ms Gibson, in the Sydney Olympic Park 2050 strategy one of the changes from I think the 2030 strategy had an identification of a school site located across the road from where the car park is that is also used for the Ferris wheel at the Easter show, and that had changed from locations that were previously on SOPA-occupied land down the bottom of the tennis courts. Do you know why those changes were made? MONICA GIBSON: I'd need to check and see if I have some detail about the Sydney Olympic master plan. It looks like Ms Fishburn is finding one. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: I might. I'm going to take this on notice, but I think the answer is because of the location of the light rail, Mr. Farlow, and the need to	Neither the 2030 Master Plan nor the Master Plan 2050 Draft Strategic Place Framework have identified the location that is the P6 car park as a school. The Draft Strategic Place Framework noted the use could be “Civic”, or “Future civic use to be tested”. The site previously nominated in the 2030 Master Plan (Site 109 adjacent to the Tennis Centre) was not considered suitable for a school in the 2050 Master Plan, due to site constraints and risks arising from high voltage power lines running underneath the site, in addition to the poor vehicular access and lack of nearby public transport.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		plan around that. But I'll take that on notice and get you some further information.	
18	62-63	The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: With respect to that SOPA-controlled land, which is under long-term lease, what are the provisions then if you are to proceed? Is it a compulsory acquisition in those terms, or is it the ending of the lease? How is that dealt with? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: I have not looked at those particular leases, so I'd just have to take that on notice and get back to you. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: If you could also take on notice how long that lease is on that site, that would be appreciated. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: Sure, yes. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: Back to the Housing Delivery Authority, with some of the changes, there have been—and I will grant you early days as well—some errors in the classification of some sites. For instance, one site—I think it was another Billbergia one—was described as Canada Bay in the minutes rather than being at Concord West. There was another one that was described as being Concord Road, Homebush, which was actually at Rhodes. In terms of those descriptions and so on, were they errors that were made just in transcription, or were they errors that were made by proponents? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: Unless Mr Gainsford is aware, I'll have to take that on notice and check for you. Generally, as you can imagine, we are working through a significant volume. It's what I would describe as being a victim of your own success. I'm pretty sure, Mr. Farlow, I said to you I had no idea we would get this many in, which maybe shows ignorance on my behalf. If there are a few errors made, there are a few errors made, and I will apologise to anyone, but there has been no intent to misrepresent anything.	Questions relating to the acquisition pathway for land for a school should be referred to the Minister for Education. The lease over the site nominated in the draft Master Plan 2050 for a school expires in May 2097.
19	64	The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Ms Fishburn, on 16 July this year, two independent owners of 15, 19 and 21 Leeds Street, Rhodes, wrote to the department after learning only from online media that five months earlier their land had been included in a State significant development declaration that	Owners' consent is not required at the EOI/declaration stage as it is not a development application with owners' consent requirements – it is a declaration of an assessment pathway.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		your authority had recommended and the Minister had signed. What happened then? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: Do you want to speak to this, David? DAVID GAINSFORD: Yes, thanks, Mr Latham. My understanding is, soon after that, we received a request for secretary's environmental assessment requirements, which we mentioned a little bit earlier today. The secretary's environmental assessment requirements didn't include those properties, as we've mentioned today, so we obviously updated the declaration to be in line with the SEARs request. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Did you take any legal advice as to whether you could retrospectively do that and whether the process needed to recommence? DAVID GAINSFORD: Yes. In fact, all the orders that we prepare with regard to declarations of State significant development are things that are managed by our legal team. Our legal team would have updated that order, and that would have been put to the Minister to update that declaration. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: What communication did you have with Billbergia to ask them why they hadn't got the consent in the first place, which then caused this problem—corrected, you say, by the SEARs process? DAVID GAINSFORD: I'd have to take that on notice in terms of the direct consultation that we had with Billbergia during that period.	Once SEARs requests were submitted, the Housing Delivery Authority assessment team reviewed the lots identified within the SEARs request and noted a difference from the declared lots. Accordingly, the declaration was amended.
20	65-66	The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Further, to the witness, the whole basis of parliamentary privilege is not necessarily to protect scoundrels like me from lawfare. It's to ensure that the Parliament has protections for itself and its witnesses to get to the truth of what's gone on, because we can't legislate on anything unless we know the truth and can handle the truth. So please read away. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: Would you like me to read you the probity adviser's role? The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Yes, I would.	The Minister has requested the Department engage an independent probity advisor to review the EOI evaluation, Minister's declaration, SEARs request and amended declaration process for EOI 229650. All EOI submission information, Department briefing material and the independent probity advisors notes from the February 2025 Housing Delivery Authority meeting will be shared with the probity advisors undertaking the review. We anticipate the review will be undertaken in a matter of weeks.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		KIERSTEN FISHBURN: It reads: 1. Observation of pre briefing administrative processes including provision of the briefing agenda in EOI papers prior to a briefing. 2. Review of confirmation from each member on the listed EOIs. 3. Provide advice on declared conflict of interests and nomination of alternative members. 4. Observation of HDA briefing conduct and deliberations. 5. Evaluation of procedural fairness in decision-making. 6. Observation of post briefing confirmation by each member of the briefing record 7. Observation of the publication of the briefing record in accordance with the Procedures The objective is to confirm whether the briefing process is conducted in accordance with the HDA Operational Procedures and public sector probity standards. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Did that include the initial role of the probity adviser at the February meeting? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: That's the probity adviser's role, yes. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: That's the role at the meeting? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: No, some of that is pre-meeting, some of that is post-meeting and some of it is during the meeting. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: And all of that is going to be reviewed by the new independent probity review that you're now scoping? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: I need to look at the terms of reference of that new review. I don't think the role of the—it's a probity review to review the probity role as well. Sorry, I'm not at my best today. I'm not feeling 100 per cent. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: It's not Life of Brian, but surely the probity review would want to look at the initial probity processes.	The scope of the review will also include interviews with affected parties that can be undertaken at the discretion of the probity advisors in their investigation.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		DAVID GAINSFORD: Mr Latham, happy to take that on notice in terms of what the terms of reference are.	
21	68	The CHAIR: With respect, this was a pretty significant decision, I thought. It's not every day the section —oh, my gosh, I was going to say 79C—4.15 considerations have been blown open, so to speak, in such a way. Obviously my bias here, in a beneficial way, of course—an important way. On that, Mr Gainsford, you said that you think that the companies would likely be undertaking their own due diligence. Do you say that on the basis of any actual conversations that you may have had, or is that just an assumption? DAVID GAINSFORD: Outside of MACH Energy? The CHAIR: Yes, outside of MACH Energy. DAVID GAINSFORD: I haven't personally had conversations with other applicants for coalmine extensions or new applications. I could take on notice whether we've had conversations through the team with those applicants. The CHAIR: I would be really interested, only for the sense of understanding how serious it is being taken, because I imagine it would be. KIERSTEN FISHBURN: Yes.	Applicants with projects currently underway are generally aware of the judgement. The Department has advised these matters will need to be considered in the assessment documentation for their respective projects.
22	69-70	The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Yes. Now the urban development is taking hold, everyone—the Ingham family and Lendlease are all building houses along there. It's hard to believe that the earlier scientific assessment could still be valid. Shouldn't we have an updated assessment based on the fact that a suburb is being built from Rosemeadow to Appin? MONICA GIBSON: Thanks for the question. You're referring to the study that was done by the Chief Scientist and Engineer several years ago. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Several years ago, yes. MONICA GIBSON: There were recommendations from that report that we've been implementing, and that includes the establishment of koala protection corridors of certain widths in certain locations. That work has been going on as you see that urban development occurring. We are also, at the same time, protecting new areas for a koala corridor to connect them to the Georges	Since the release of the Office of the Chief Scientist and Engineer advice regarding the protection of koala populations associated with the Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan in 2020, a number of new biodiversity and koala studies have been prepared to inform rezoning proposals or development applications which are publicly available.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		River National Park. Some of those roadworks you're seeing are koala crossings to help achieve the recommendations from the chief scientist's report about how koalas will move through that corridor and into the very large areas of the national park. It's joint work between a number of agencies. As you can imagine, the environment agency has a significant role here. They might be able to answer some more questions in relation to that. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: Could you take those on notice? Has the scientific report been updated? You drive along now, and it is literally a construction zone. No-one loves koalas and wombats more than me. You've got to be practical. It's hard to believe they could possibly survive in what is an urban construction zone. If I was a koala, I'd be heading all the other way, down to Wedderburn and Wollongong, to get away from the chaos. MONICA GIBSON: There have been a number of additional koala investigations and environmental studies that have been done with each stage of the roadworks. Environmental assessment is required at each of those stages. The transport agency have been working on those. The Hon. MARK LATHAM: It's not just the roadworks. It's the bulldozers everywhere building suburbs. Do you understand that it's a housing development, when koalas need to be in a vegetation area or a park, not the chaos of bulldozers everywhere in suburban development? MONICA GIBSON: I'd be very happy to take it on notice to provide you with a list of the technical studies and environmental assessments that have been undertaken with each stage of those.	
23	72	The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: Noting that you said you weren't familiar specifically with this one, are you able to provide me some advice on notice about Winterbourne and where that's up to as far as accommodation? DAVID GAINSFORD: I'm happy to do that, yes.	In response to further background on the Winterbourne Wind project workers accommodation: • The EIS and Amendment Report notes that the applicant would develop and implement a Workforce Accommodation Strategy. • Walcha, Uralla and Tamworth Councils expressed concern about this approach and the potential for impact on existing housing stock and accommodation availability.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
			• The Department has requested further information from the applicant on this issue including how the project would mitigate impacts of the peak construction workforce on short term accommodation availability. • The applicant is considering its response, and the Department is aware that the applicant is: ○ in discussions with the owner of Walcha caravan park to purchase it. ○ in discussions with Uralla Council to build accommodation on Council land, via a local development application. • The Department has not yet received formal response to its request for further information but will consider this issue in its assessment of the project.
24	72-73	The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: Effectively, you can lodge greenfield applications, but to date have there been any greenfield applications that have been approved? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: There definitely has been. I'd have to take on notice the number. I think I know where you're going with this. Maybe I'll give a little bit of context around some of the discussions and the thinking that might occur in the HDA. As you're probably aware, the Housing Delivery Authority was established with the intention of housing that could be delivered quickly into the system, mostly during the housing accord period and, importantly, that could be assessed in a short time in the department. We say 90 days in our hands, 275 days in total. Proponents have the gift to bring that down further, if they choose to work proactively. Some of the discussions that have occurred—and it's not just greenfields, but predominantly regional and rural—might be a really great proposal, but the infrastructure is not available to service it at this point in time, so it's simply not going to be delivered during the housing accord period; or it is a type of rezoning where there is complexity to the rezoning.	I refer you to the response provided by Ms Monica Gibson on page 78 of the transcript.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		We've recently made changes to make this more abundantly clear in the HDA criteria. For example, agricultural land to residential land is a decision you would want to be quite cautious about. You'd want to make sure you were undertaking the right technical studies and it was a no regrets decision. That's not going to happen quickly. As a consequence, while there may be merit to it, it's not suitable for the HDA and that's why we say there are alternative pathways that are available to them. In regional and rural areas in relation to the enabling infrastructure, it's predominantly sewer and water that is the challenge. In those circumstances, planning and rezoning is better to go through council in the first instance because they're also the sewer and water provider. Did I answer your question? I think we've done this a fair few times now, Mr Farlow. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: I think we've got pretty much all of it. You've got a fair level of intuition when it comes to some of my questions, thank you. This question might be for Ms Gibson with respect to Macquarie Park. Of course, we've seen the announcement today of a new high school for Macquarie Park, which is welcome. What the projected population increase for Macquarie Park over the next five, 10 and 20 years? MONICA GIBSON: Could I please take that question on notice? The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: Yes, you can.	
25	74	The CHAIR: Can I throw very quickly to you, Secretary. This relates to compliance, but it's in relation to Hornsby council. Hornsby council recently resolved to introduce a new compliance enforcement policy, and part of that policy deals with the investigations of breaches of development consent conditions and plans that involve private certifiers. Council's new policy states that it will not investigate building works that are not in accordance with plans when a certifier has been appointed. Have you heard of anything like this? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: That hasn't come across my desk yet, so I'm going to have to take that on notice. I haven't seen it. I have spoken to Hornsby council recently and they didn't raise it with me, so I'll take that on notice and see what information I can get.	No. NSW Planning does not regulate the actions of local government and has no ability to rescind any adopted, internal policies of council. Regarding interaction with privately certified projects, the NSW Building Commissioner may be better placed to respond to this request.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
26	74-75	The CHAIR: Can I ask—I think this would be you, Mr Gainsford—about the EPA's guide for large emitters? I'm advised that key elements of the guide have not been followed for any of the coal expansions approved so far this year. Can you confirm in the assessment and determination of Mount Arthur, the HVO, Ulan and Tahmoor that there was no interim and long-term greenhouse gas goals set, no independent review of the proposed greenhouse gas mitigation plans and no independent reviews of offset plans? Does that sound right to you? DAVID GAINSFORD: I must admit, Chair, that that doesn't sound right. You're referring there to, obviously, a number of projects that are on foot in terms of their assessment. We obviously seek advice from the EPA. You mentioned the EPA's guide for large emitters. As I understand it, obviously there's a trigger in terms of CO2-equivalent emissions that is related to that. And that relates, as you would know, to environment protection licences for those projects. We seek a range of information associated with our assessment of greenhouse gas emissions and mitigation associated with those assessments, so I'd be very surprised, without knowing all the details of what you've just referred to, that we haven't done verification and the assessment that you've mentioned there. The CHAIR: If this is the case and these haven't been done, is that something that you would be willing to look at and provide an understanding to us on why, if in the event that's the case and that these three things haven't happened—i.e., there's no interim and long-term goals set, no independent review of the mitigation plan and no independent review of the offset plans. If that isn't the case, could you advise as to why that would be the case? DAVID GAINSFORD: I'm happy to take that on notice, Chair. It really doesn't sound right from my perspective. Obviously with coalmines that are actually in operation, as we've talked about in previous budget estimates, there's a whole requirement to be providing updates, in terms of yearly updates. There are three yearly independent audits that occur. We are constantly reviewing opportunities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with those projects.	A draft version of the <i>NSW Guide for Large Emitters</i> was published in May 2024, and the final version was published in January 2025. Like all new policies, there is a transitional period for their application. The applications for Mount Arthur Mod 2 (determined April 2025), Hunter Valley Operations Mod 8 (determined April 2025) and Tahmoor South Mod 3 (determined May 2025) and Ulan Mod 6 (determined May 2025) were lodged before the <i>NSW Guide for Large Emitters</i> came into effect. However, the Department carefully consulted with the EPA, including the DCCEE Net Zero Emissions Modelling team (NZEM) on these projects noting that draft guidelines were available prior to their determination. No residual issues were raised by either agency. All four modifications included conditions to prepare a Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Plan in consultation with the EPA noting that the Applicants will be required to prepare and implement a Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Plan (or similar) in accordance with requirements provided by the EPA under the <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i>. The process for setting long term goals and the review of the mitigation plan is the role of the EPA as the primary regulator of greenhouse gas emissions in NSW.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
27	75-76	The CHAIR: In terms of what the guide is capturing—I suppose I'm a bit surprised. The scope one emissions in 2024 for Peabody—that Metropolitan were the highest levels, that since 2016 the levels of emissions are so high. I think it was almost 700,000 tonnes of CO₂, so it doesn't seem to be making a whole lot of sense about when the guidelines kick in. Are the guidelines, in your view, in terms of the projects before the department—is the threshold the right threshold to be having an effect on requiring the emissions reductions? DAVID GAINSFORD: Chair, these are not our guidelines; these are the EPA's guidelines, so I wouldn't be best placed to comment on that. The CHAIR: I realise that. I think what I'm trying to say is, with the proposals that are coming to you, are most of them not triggering those guidelines? That, I suppose, is the question I'm trying to ask. DAVID GAINSFORD: I'd have to take that on notice, Chair, in terms of which ones are triggering the guidelines, which ones aren't. The CHAIR: Is it possible, with the ones that are currently in front of you, to provide us with the advice on which ones have triggered them and which ones haven't? DAVID GAINSFORD: Yes, I'm happy to take that on notice, Chair. The CHAIR: Thank you very much. Sorry, I feel like now I'm loading you up with a bunch of work. Can you please clarify what Roberta Ryan's role is in the New South Wales department in terms of the rollout of the Social Impact Assessment Guideline? DAVID GAINSFORD: Specifically, Chair, Roberta Ryan's role, I'm actually not able to give you. Obviously, we've recently updated the Social Impact Assessment Guideline and produced those updates and publicised those updates. I'm not actually aware, and I'm happy to take it on notice, in terms of Roberta Ryan's role. The CHAIR: The reason it's been raised with me is because Ms Ryan appeared as an expert witness in legal proceedings, and it was stated in	Projects currently under assessment by the Department trigger 'Guide for Large Emitters' There are currently 11 applications for coal extraction projects (both new SSDs and Modifications) under assessment by the Department. Two were lodged before 2022 prior to the implementation of the EPA's 'Guideline for Large Emitters' so are covered by transitional arrangements. One project does not meet the threshold in the Guideline for it to apply, and one is still under consideration by the EPA to determine if it meets the threshold. Seven meet the threshold and trigger the application of the Guideline. Social Impact Assessment (SIA) Guidelines and Roberta Ryan's role Professor Ryan was not involved in the development or recent refinement of the SIA Guidelines. DPHI staff held a webinar on 7 August 2025, presenting the recent refinements to the Guidelines. Professor Ryan joined DPHI staff, as an expert SIA practitioner, to support the Q&A session that followed the update presentation.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		those legal proceedings by the Chief Judge of the New South Wales Land and Environment Court—literally these words; it's in a public judgement: “Dr Ryan's evidence were flawed in methodology, coverage of issues and dependence on other expert evidence that is also flawed.” It's been raised with me because it was such an important social impact case about coalmines. Somebody has asked me to raise with you whether she had a role in developing the social impact guidelines. If you could provide— DAVID GAINSFORD: Not that I'm aware of, Chair, but I'd be happy to take it on notice.	
28	78	The Hon. SCOTT BARRETT: Thank you. I want to turn to the Mid North Coast. I understand there's a 36-site retirement complex at Bellingen that's currently moving through the approval process from council at the moment. It's currently being held up because of incorrectly applied flame zone mapping and reporting. I just wonder what options they now have to challenge those maps when apparently the RFS has even conceded the information is incorrect? KIERSTEN FISHBURN: Firstly, I'd have to take the context of that on notice. I'm not aware of every council development. My suggestion would be that the proponent contacts the Housing Taskforce. It's their job to work with interagency deliberations in the planning system. Or I'm happy if you provide the details to me and we'll make contact directly.	Details of the development application can be provided by Bellingen Shire Council. In consultation with the NSW Rural Fire Service, all bushfire mapping matters can be resolved by Bellingen Shire Council through the development assessment process.
29	80-81	The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: What other dwelling caps exist across Greater Sydney? MONICA GIBSON: There's probably a number that I am aware of and some that I'm not aware of, because some of them will be matters that are of State interest, where we will have a role in lifting those, and some might be matters where it's more between the council and an infrastructure provider. That could be Sydney Water. But I can tell you about the ones that I do know of. We had one in the Hills local government area for the showgrounds precinct. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: This was one you revised a year ago or so.	I refer you to the response provided by Ms Monica Gibson on pages 82 and 83 of the transcript.

Budget Estimates 2025-26 – Questions on Notice – Planning and Public Spaces

Q#	Pg.	Question (Transcript)	Answer
		MONICA GIBSON: It was one that we revised after advice from Education and Transport about the infrastructure that was being delivered or planned to be delivered in that area. We are also in active discussions with Wollondilly council about the staged release of land in the greater Macarthur area, particularly around Appin and areas there, and that relates to water and transport infrastructure. The Hon. SCOTT FARLOW: If you could take any other dwelling caps on notice, that would be appreciated as well. MONICA GIBSON: Yes, I'll give you some more examples.	